The implications in terms of resources for the histology department when handling multiple duodenal biopsies in all patients with iron deficiency anaemia are considerable and this is currently the subject of an internal audit at our hospital. Although for the reasons stated anti-EMA has high sensitivity and specificity, there is potential for considerable improvement in this area, with close to 100% values for both being possible, particularly with newer assays that will be automated and more efficient. Paradoxically, when these tests become more widely available there may be many more referrals to gastroenterology departments due to positive serological tests and this may in fact increase the further number of duodenal biopsy specimens reaching histopathology departments even if duodenal biopsy were a second line test. We wonder if the guidelines for duodenal biopsy and antidiEMA-EMA should be the subject of further discussion.
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Reply

Eakin.—Pearce et al raise the possibility of using the endomysial antibody (EMA) test instead of histology of small bowel biopsies as a test for coeliac disease in the investigation of iron deficiency anaemia (IDA). They wish to consider this because of the considerable resource implications for histology departments.

The EMA test is excellent but its value is dependent on the prevalence of coeliac disease in the population being tested (the pre-test probability). Based on all peer reviewed published studies from 1985 to 1999, we have calculated specificity to be 98.4% (95% confidence interval (CI) 98.0–98.8) and sensitivity to be 93.8% (95% CI 92.7–94.9).1 These give a likelihood ratio for a positive test of 59 and for a negative test of 0.01. We have found that a positive EMA test can diagnose coeliac disease in IDA is 4%. Thus using the Fagan nomogram, if the EMA test is positive, the post-test probability of coeliac disease is 75%—that is, one in four patients with IDA who have a positive EMA test will have normal histology on small bowel biopsy. If the EMA test is negative, the post-test probability is 0.2%, which effectively excludes coeliac disease.

We therefore agree that the EMA test could be used instead of small bowel biopsy to exclude coeliac disease in patients with IDA. However, as most of the cost of obtaining a histological diagnosis may be in the endoscopic examination (during which small bowel biopsies are taken by most gastroenterologists since we validated the technique in 1981) and as most patients will be having an endoscopy anyway, it seemed reasonable to us to apply the definitive test (that is, histology) in all those undergoing endoscopy. For those not undergoing endoscopy, such as menstruating women under 45 years, we recommend the EMA test in our guidelines.

We agree that patchiness of mucosal abnormality, which we formally documented in 1976, needs to be taken into consideration and we routinely take at least four endoscopic biopsies. We realise that this may increase the cost of histology. If after a proper cost benefit study histology is found to be excessively expensive, consideration could be given to immediate stereomicroscopic assessment of biopsies which was popular in the 1960s and early 1970s,2 and which we still apply when time allows. This is a very simple technique which allows visualisation at a glance of the whole surface of biopsies as well as helping to unfold and correctly orientate the specimens before fixation if histology is still deemed necessary. However, both this and high resolution endoscopy need to be objectively interpreted and would also need good quality photography for a permanent record if fixed biopsies were not stored.

In conclusion, we agree that the EMA test is a reasonable alternative to histological diagnosis of coeliac disease in IDA but until we have a proper cost benefit study indicating otherwise, we recommend histology of endoscopic small bowel biopsies when endoscopy is already being undertaken.

B B SCOTT
Lincoln County Hospital, Lincoln LN2 4BJ, UK
dbbscott@aol.com

Is coeliac disease a confounding factor in the diagnosis of NASH?

EDITOR,—We read with great interest the paper by Wigg et al (Gut 2001;48:206–11) concerning the role of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth in the pathogenesis of non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), but we would like to comment on the enrolment criteria used for their study. We agree with Farrell (Gut 2001;48:148–9) that the Adelaide group’s failure to characterise the variables of obesity and diabetes in their population might result in selection bias. Moreover, they made no attempt to exclude the possibility of coeliac disease (CD) which can also be associated with altered intestinal permeability even when the disease is subclinical.

In approximately 40% of all adults with this disease, increased serum transaminase levels are found at diagnosis, and such elevations may be the only abnormality in cases of “occult” CD. In fact, in a study by Bardella et al, 9.3% of cases of unexplained chronic hypertransaminasaemia were ultimately diagnosed as CD.

From December 1997 to December 1999, we observed 30 subjects (22 males, eight females; mean age 40 (9.3) years; mean weight 71.6 (7.9) kg) with clinical and laboratory pictures fully compatible with a diagnosis of NASH—that is, AST 56.3 (13.6) IU/l (normal 7–45); ALT 102 (36.8) IU/l (normal 7–45); histological findings of macrovesicular steatosis, inflammation, hepatic fibrosis, and Mallory’s bodies; no history of alcohol consumption; and no other significant liver disease. All 30 patients had serum pictures of diabetes. Autoantibodies to GAD65 and insulin were positive in all 30 patients. Coeliac disease, with perhaps a similar pathogenetic mechanism to small intestinal bacterial overgrowth, was present in 50% of patients.

In our study, small intestinal bacterial overgrowth was present in 50% of patients. We have always considered that the pathogenesis of NASH is likely to be multifactorial. Coeliac disease, with perhaps a similar pathogenetic mechanism to small intestinal bacterial overgrowth, could be another important contributing factor in the development of NASH.
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Induction of multiple autoantibodies to islet cell antigens during treatment with interferon alpha for chronic hepatitis C

EDITOR,—Induction or augmentation of autoimmune immunity during the treatment of chronic hepatitis C with interferon alpha is a well known phenomenon and a matter of great concern to physicians involved in the field of viral hepatitis. In recent years there have been a number of reports suggesting a link between the antiviral therapy and the development of antibodies to multiple autoantigens. In a recent issue of Gut, Wesche et al (Gut 2001;48:378–83) described the appearance of antibodies to 21-hydroxylase, an autoantigen of the adrenal cortex, and autoantibodies to glutamate decarboxylase 65 (GAD65) and the tyrosine phosphatase IA2 (IA2), both important autoantigens with respect to the pathogenesis of autoimmune (type 1) diabetes. Autoantibodies to GAD65 and IA2 appeared during or after therapy with alpha interferon for chronic hepatitis C in 5/62 and 1/62 patients, respectively. However, none of these patients was positive for both antibodies.

Type 1 diabetes is regarded as a chronic autoimmune disease caused by selective destruction of the insulin producing β cells. The disease is mediated by T cells; autoantibodies are well established markers for an ongoing autoimmune process within the islets. As these autoantibodies usually appear prior to the clinical onset of the disease, they may be used to predict type 1 diabetes in predisposed individuals. In recent studies it has been shown that only those individuals in whom more than one diabetes related autoantibody could be determined are at considerable risk of developing type 1 diabetes. Overall, the risk of developing type 1 diabetes is therefore unlikely to be a confounding factor in our important observation of a high prevalence of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth and elevated serum TNF-α levels in NASH patients.

In our study, small intestinal bacterial overgrowth was present in 50% of patients. We have always considered that the pathogenesis of NASH is likely to be multifactorial. Coeliac disease, with perhaps a similar pathogenetic mechanism to small intestinal bacterial overgrowth, could be another important contributing factor in the development of NASH.
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Reply

EDITOR,—We thank Grieco et al for their important observation that NASH may be associated with occult coeliac disease (13% in their series). We have also been interested in the possibility of this association. Coeliac disease, like small intestinal bacterial overgrowth, can be associated with increased intestinal permeability. It is plausible therefore that they could also share a similar pathogenetic mechanism resulting in non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) (that is, translocation of gut bacteria, Kupffer cell stimulation, and production of tumour necrosis factor α (TNF-α), proinflammatory cytokine, and reactive oxygen species, resulting in liver inflammation).

In our series of NASH patients, none had a prior diagnosis of coeliac disease or suggestive symptoms. We also tested for antigliadin IgA and IgG antibodies (unpublished data). Three patients had positive antibodies (one positive for both antibodies, and two positive for the antigliadin IgG antibody only). One of these patients has been further investigated and coeliac disease has been confirmed histologically.

Although prior autoantibody investigation is required in the remaining two patients to exclude coeliac disease, it is possible that three patients (14%) in our NASH series could have occult coeliac disease (a value similar to that reported by Grieco et al). None of the possible coeliac disease patients however had positive breath tests and their mean TNF-α levels did not significantly differ from the mean of the other NASH patients. Coeliac disease is therefore unlikely to be a confounding factor in our important observation of a high prevalence of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth and elevated serum TNF-α levels in NASH patients.
ICA, islet cell antibodies; GAD65, autoantibodies to glutamate decarboxylase 65; IA2, autoantibodies to tyrosine phosphatase IA2; IAA, insulin autoantibodies.

exclude the existence of any of these autoantibodies prior to interferon alpha therapy. We identified four patients with diabetes related autoantibodies after cessation of therapy with interferon alpha (table 1). None of the patients had any of these antibodies prior to antiviral therapy nor had they a positive family history for autoimmune diabetes. Patient Nos 3 and 4 only developed insulin autoantibodies at a low titre. Induction of antibodies to insulin is a known phenomenon during therapy with interferon alpha and is described in a frequent number of cases.4 Overall, these patients seem to have a low risk of progressing to clinically overt diabetes. Patient No 1 was found to be positive for insulin and GAD65 autoantibodies. Based on prospective clinical studies, this patient has an intermediate risk of developing diabetes.5 We have now followed the patient for 16 months after interferon therapy and he has not developed an abnormal fasting glucose so far. The most striking example for induction of diabetes related autoantibodies was found in patient No 2. He developed three major autoantibodies during interferon therapy in patients with hepatitis C virus chronic infection. Diabetes Care 2000; 23:1177–81.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient No/sex/age</th>
<th>Mode of infection/genotype of HCV</th>
<th>Date of interferon therapy</th>
<th>Diabetes related autoantibodies</th>
<th>Estimated risk for type 1 diabetes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No 1/male/52 y</td>
<td>Unknown/genotype 1</td>
<td>8/8/98–9/99</td>
<td>IAA, GAD 65</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 2/male/49 y</td>
<td>IV drug use/genotype 1</td>
<td>9/98–9/99</td>
<td>ICA, GAD, IA2</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 4/male/41 y</td>
<td>Unknown/genotype 3</td>
<td>11/98–9/99</td>
<td>IAA</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ERCP training

EDITOR,—The leading article “ERCP training—time for change” by Hellier and Morris (Gut 2000; 47:459–60) addresses important issues. Views as to how endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) training should change may vary considerably between those in the average district general hospital (DGH) serving 220 000–250 000, and those in larger units, frequently serving populations of around 500 000. Issues as to how endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography training is delivered should change may vary considerably between those in the average district general hospital (DGH) serving 220 000–250 000, and those in larger units, frequently serving populations of around 500 000.

Visceral hypersensitivity has been identified as a significant feature in a proportion of patients with irritable bowel symptoms.1,2 Reinnervation following a difficult intra-partum episode may be an important contributory factor. Many benign pelvic symptoms may be interpreted as pain or discomfort in response to touch (alloception or hyperalgesia), including chronic pelvic pain, deep dyspareunia, urinary urgency, tampon discomfort, dysmenorrhoea, etc. Premature and prolonged maternal voluntary efforts in the second stage of labour may be an important contributory factor for CPD by trainers.

Finally, my recent experience of SpR applicants for a consultant post had its illuminating responses to touch (alloception or hyperalgesia), including chronic pelvic pain, deep dyspareunia, urinary urgency, tampon discomfort, dysmenorrhoea, etc. Premature and prolonged maternal voluntary efforts in the second stage of labour may be an important contributory factor for CPD by trainers.

Reinnervation after childbirth—a new paradigm for sensory bowel symptoms?
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BOOK REVIEWS


If asked to supply a subtitle for this excellent eminently readable book, I would suggest “All you ever wanted to know about the basics of colorectal cancer but were afraid to ask”. I am sure that many of you assumed that people would expect you to know already”. The chapters are written by experts renowned in their field and each topic is dealt with comprehensively and clearly with the reader being led from one line of argument to the next in a satisfyingly logical way. Although aimed at the clinician rather than the scientist, where necessary the scientific evidence is given in sufficient detail without overwhelming the non-expert with technical jargon. Similarly, in this era of evidence based medicine, the authors are to be congratulated on choosing judiciously the most relevant clinical trials which help explain the development of currently accepted clinical practice. Areas of controversy (such as the use of total mesorectal excision (TME) in rectal cancer) are presented in a fair and (largely) unbiased way.

Perhaps a few more figures or diagrams might have been useful, although the easily readable text makes this less of a problem than it might have been (I assume the labeling of the first two figures in the chapter on adjuvant chemotherapy which does not correspond with the text will have been corrected by the time the book is published).

There are a few minor quibbles concerning details of individual chapters. The statement that in rectal cancer the use of TME to reduce local recurrence rates to less than 10% precludes the need for adjuvant therapy should have read adjuvant radiotherapy—adjuvant chemotherapy is still indicated in these patients. The chapter on surgery for recurrence/metastatic disease deals mainly with local recurrence: it would have been interesting to have greater discussion of the role of surgery for hepatic and pulmonary metastases. A short historical introduction to the Dukes’ staging system (although well known) and its modifications (perhaps not so well known) would have been appreciated in the chapter on pathology. Some readers may find a little too much technical detail in the otherwise excellent chapter on radiotherapy.

The authors of the chapter on adjuvant chemotherapy may have changed their emphasis on radiotherapy as the “prime adjuvant weapon” in rectal cancer if they had known the results of the recently published NSABP-R02 trial which showed that radiotherapy seems to be more useful at reducing local recurrence rates (which is probably more of a problem in the subgroup of patients with positive circumferential margins or who undergo suboptimal surgery) rather than improving overall survival; the clinical choice for adjuvant treatment in these patients is probably between chemotherapy alone or combined chemoradiation.

The chapter on future directions misses the opportunity to discuss in greater detail the potential of the new drugs irinotecan, oxaliplatin, and the oral fluoropyrimidines. A separate chapter on imaging techniques might be considered for the next edition, considering the increasing interest in virtual colonoscopy and the value of MRI in helping to determine the resectability of rectal tumours.

I am somewhat loath to mention these points as they are probably a reflection of individual opinion and certainly should not detract from this valuable book, which would be an excellent introduction for a registrar or SHO plunged into the field and expected to be a knowhere about the wider field. Likewise, as the relevance of a multidisciplinary approach to colorectal cancer becomes increasingly important, it is essential that the specialist in one discipline keeps up to date with the current literature and related specialties: a function which this books serves admirably.

M ALLEN


This is a monumental effort and the editors, who have written much of this textbook themselves, are to be congratulated on a terrific job. They have taken on the task of reworking the iconic textbook first started by the late and great John Goligher. His was a very personal style, with repeated references to his own practice and results, and then a weighing of the evidence and a firm opinion, an approach which was much loved. With the growing emphasis on a larger body of evidence, the editors have widened their search in the world’s literature and updated it for the now established specialty of colorectalology which tends to be surgical but spans the many disciplines looking after patients with diseases of the lower gastrointestinal tract. And here, despite the view that electronic publishing will consign many textbooks to history, is a second edition, tribute to its success and what Vie Fazio in his foreword calls the perspective “thing”. There must still be a place for one or two prominent and authoritative reference textbooks in any specialty provided they are kept up to date, and I have no doubt this will continue to be just such a tome.

There is much here which will be of interest to gastrointestinal endoscopists as well as surgeons. If you want to argue the point with your local surgeon, give a talk which includes some surgical outcomes, write a medicolegal report, or find a reference, it is all there. The style of the previous edition has been retained, with clear text, excellent line drawings, and helpful tables. The bibliography arranged at the end of each section is exhaustive and comprehensive. New sections have been added on medi- cals management of anal fissure, never treatments for incontinence, and the combined management of pelvic floor disorders. In inflammatory bowel disease, the place of newer therapies have been discussed, and pouch salvage procedures are reviewed. Cancer has been updated with additions to the whole area of biology, notably hereditary polyposis syndromes, as well as adjuvant therapy. The chapter on laparoscopy in colorectal cancer which includes length of stay and cost issues, is all the more relevant with the recent pronouncement of the NICE in concluding that open surgery still has room for improvement, and until specialisation and quality improve these results and there are clear advantages, laparoscopy will remain in abeyance outside clinical trials. A good examination of the place of local excision includes transanal endoscopic microsurgery but with so many surgical staff carrying out one or two operations, the technique was rather short and the newer approaches to polyectomy, including endoscopic mucosal resection, and placement of clips and ligatures, and tattooing was disappointing.

Inevitably there are some gaps. Although the place of nitrates is reviewed for the treatment of fissure, the more recent introduction of calcium channel blockers and a growing disinterest with GTN are missed. In the management of Crohn’s fistulae, anti-tumour necrosis factor may have a profound impact on surgical practice but this too did not reach the cut. And the controversial new stapling procedure for haemorrhoids arrived too recently for inclusion.

These are minor criticisms however. Although it comes in two hefty volumes and at a similarly weighty price, this is a monumental textbook.

It is in my view the finest reference textbook on the subject on both sides of the Atlantic, and will be taken frequently and enjoyably from the bookshelves in offices and studies of those who really care deeply about the management, medical and surgical, of these embarrassing, distressing, and challenging conditions. The owners will just have to make sure the books are returned.

N MORTENSEN


The choice of title for a book can make or break its sales. Despite any caution or maturity of judgement we may claim, it seems we are all at risk of being seduced by books with titles such as “Improve your golf?”, or “Make the stock market work for you”. Read the book and find the success/wealth/glamorous lifestyle or whatever that has eluded you up to now. Practical management of oesophageal disease is in this mould—the title hints not at a glamorous lifestyle admittedly, but at delivering the easy answers gastroenterologists would like to find for all oesophageal problems. And of course it does not deliver them. However, if expectations are tempered to the real world rather than fantasy, this is a useful book, written by people who know their subject, describing what they do and why.

In 12 chapters, the 20 authors give their own perspectives on the major topics in oesophageal disease. There is a surgical bias for example, medical management of gastro-oesophageal reflux disease is covered in two
Michael Marsh's latest book on coeliac disease started out at a distinct disadvantage as I took it with a pile of novels to read while on a summer holiday in Provence. However, he need not have worried; this is a distinctive book and, to someone interested in coeliac disease, it came as a refreshing approach to reading something of real value for everyone.

In fact, this quality is the essence of the book—it has something in it of value to almost every gastroenterologist. For example, even physicians professing a major interest in the gut may be just a little vague about the surgical techniques of an Ivor Lewis oesophagectomy, and if they need the detail they will find it here. Upper gastrointestinal surgeons may welcome information about the otorhinolaryngologists' views on modern management of pharyngeal pouch and hypopharyngeal carcinoma, and the explanation of a physiologist's approach to use of the oesophageal manometry. Both medical and surgical gastroenterologists are likely to value clear expositions of the place of chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and multimodality treatments for patients with oesophageal cancer. For clinicians whose interest in the oesophagus ends with onward referral of patients who do not get better with a proton pump inhibitor, there is still something of value—they will at least be helped to interpret the clinical history.

The editors and publishers have done well—the book is easy to hold, easy to use, and easy to read. Reality being as it is, you will not find answers to all of your questions or solutions to all oesophageal problems, but it is likely that you will be made to the wizardry of Marsh and colleagues, I return to the witchcraft of Harry Potter.
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Sir Francis Avery Jones British Society of Gastroenterology Research Award 2002

Applications are invited by the Education Committee of the British Society of Gastroenterology who will recommend to Council the recipient of the 2002 Award. Applications (TWENTY COPIES) should include:

- A manuscript (2 A4 pages ONLY) describing the work conducted
- A bibliography of relevant personal publications
- An outline of the proposed content of the lecture, including title
- A written statement confirming that all or a substantial part of the work has been personally conducted in the UK or Eire.

Entries must be 40 years or less on 31 December 2001 but need not be a member of the Society. The recipient will be required to deliver a 30 minute lecture at the Annual meeting of the Society in Birmingham in March 2002. Applications (TWENTY COPIES) should be made to the Honorary Secretary, British Society of Gastroenterology, 3 St Andrews Place, London NW1 4LB by 1 December 2001.

Hopkins Endoscopy Prize 2002

Applications are invited by the Endoscopy Committee of the British Society of Gastroenterology who will recommend to Council the recipient of the 2002 Award. Applications (TEN COPIES) should include:

- A manuscript (2 A4 pages ONLY) describing the work conducted
- A bibliography of relevant personal publications
- An outline of the proposed content of the lecture, including title
- A written statement confirming that all or a substantial part of the work has been personally conducted in the UK or Eire.

An applicant need not be a member of the Society. The recipient will be required to deliver a 20 minute lecture at the Annual meeting of the Society in Glasgow in March 2002. Applications (TEN COPIES) should be made to the Honorary Secretary, British Society of Gastroenterology, 3 St Andrews Place, London NW1 4LB by 1 December 2001.

Falk Symposium No 126: Hepatocyte Transplantation

This Falk Symposium will be held on 2–3 October 2001 in Hannover, Germany. Further information: Falk Foundation e.V. - Congress Division, Leinewerberstr. 5, PO Box 6529, D-79041 Freiburg, Germany. Tel: +49 761 15 14 0; fax: +49 761 15 14 359; email: symposia@falkfoundation.de
EASL Single Topic Conference
The EASL Single Topic Conference “Liver fibrosis: from basic science to clinical targets” will be held on 12–13 October 2001 in Florence, Italy. Organisers: Massimo Pinzani (University of Florence) and Detlef Schuppan (University of Erlangen-Nuernberg). The aim of the conference is to provide the latest information on this key area of hepatology and to translate the current knowledge into clinical terms. It is directed at both the expert in the field and the general hepatologist. Further information: Massimo Pinzani, Dipartimento di Medicina Interna, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Viale GB Morgagni, 85, I-50134 Firenze, Italy. Tel: +39 055 4277845; fax: +39 055 417123; email: m.pinzani@dfc.unifi.it

Lecture Course in Coloproctology
This course will be held on 15–17 October 2001 in Harrow, UK. Professor Russell Stitz from Australia will be the Sir Alan Parks Visiting Professor and, for the first time, there will be a Sir Francis Avery Jones Visiting Professor, which will be Professor Paul Rutgeerts from Belgium. Further information: The Administrator, St Mark's Academic Institute, St Mark’s Hospital, Northwick Park, Harrow, Middx, HA1 3UJ, UK. Tel: +44 (0)20 8235 4046/8; fax: +44 (0)20 8235 4039; email: stmarks@ic.ac.uk; website: www.stmarkshospital.org.uk

International Symposium on Hyperammonemia, Liver Failure and Hepatic Encephalopathy
This symposium will be held on 20–22 October 2001 in Valencia, Spain. Further information: Cátedra Santiago Grisolía, Fundación Museu de les Ciències Príncipe Felipe, Ciat de les Arts i les Ciències, Avda. Instituto Obrero, s/n, 46013 Valencia, Spain. Tel: +34 96 197 44 66; fax: +34 96 197 44 70; email: catedrasg@cac.es. Deadline for receipt of abstracts is 15 July 2001.

ICGH-2: The Second Iranian Congress of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
The main Iranian meeting of gastroenterologists and researchers in this field will be held on 27 October to 1 November 2001 in Tehran, Iran. Further information: Dr Shahin Merat, Digestive Diseases Research Center, Shariati Hospital, N. Kargar Street, Tehran 14114, Iran. Tel: +98 911 717 3966; fax: +98 21 225 3635; email: merat@ams.ac.ir; website: www.ams.ac.ir/icgh. Deadline for submission of abstracts is 31 May 2001.

Falk Symposium No 127: Autoimmune Diseases in Pediatric Gastroenterology
This Falk Symposium will be held on 8–9 November 2001 in Basel, Switzerland. Further information: see Falk Symposium No 126 above.

42nd Annual Conference of the Indian Society of Gastroenterology
This conference will be held on 23–29 November 2001 in Lucknow, India. The programme includes two pre-conference symposia (on gastrointestinal motility and scientific communication, on 23 November), a one day postgraduate course or CME (24 November), and an endoscopy workshop (28–29 November). Further information: Dr S R Naik, Department of Gastroenterology, SGPGI, Lucknow 226014, India. Tel: +91 522 440700 or 440800, ext 2400; fax: +91 522 440078 or 440017; website: www.sgpgi.ac.in/conf/isg2001.html

41st St Andrew’s Day Festival Symposium on Therapeutics
This will be held on 6–7 December 2001 in Edinburgh, UK. Further information: Ms Eileen Strawn, Symposium Co-ordinator. Tel: +44 (0)131 225 7324; fax: +44 (0)131 220 4393; email: e.strawn@rcpe.ac.uk; website: www.rcpe.ac.uk

14th Intensive European Course of Digestive Endoscopy
This course will be held on 17–18 December 2001 in Strasbourg, France. Further information: Michele Centonze Conseil, 6 bis rue des Cordiers, 75020 Paris, France. Tel: +33 1 44 62 68 80; fax: +33 1 43 49 68 58; email: mail@m-centonze-conseil.com
Induction of multiple autoantibodies to islet cell antigens during treatment with interferon alpha for chronic hepatitis C

H E Wasmuth, C Stolte, A Geier, C Gartung and S Matern

Gut 2001 49: 596-597
doi: 10.1136/gut.49.4.596a